

https://dspace.org/

Towards post-managerialism in higher education: The case study of management change at the University of The Witwatersrand 1999-2004

Johnson, Bernadette Judith

2006-11-16T11:37:25Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/1806

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the changes in the management of the higher education sector and why new trends and patterns have emerged. It discusses the following issues: (i) management and its evolution in higher education; (ii) 'managerialism' and its conceptual underpinnings; (iii) the rationale for changing management practices in higher education institutions; and (iv) the various modes of management in higher education institutions. It is argued in this chapter that the literature on current trends in university management suffers from an essentialist reductionism, which conceptualises emerging trends in university management as 'managerialism', without paying attention to the different and complex forms these assume in different contexts. This universalising approach fails to account for the peculiarities of higher education institutions in context. The chapter points to the need for reframing these conceptualisations by looking more closely at collegiality and the specificity of the empirical data. It therefore turns to a discussion on collegiality and concludes with a conceptual framework that will guide the study.

2.2 Management and its Evolution in Higher Education

'Management' refers to the structure and process of implementing decisions, 'governance' to the process of making decisions and 'leadership' to the structures

and processes through which decisions are influenced.[14] In as far as management is about implementing decisions, management has existed since the beginning of higher education institutions. An attempt to define what management entails with greater precision and formalisation in higher education has been an important phenomenon since the beginning of the 20th century. As will be discussed below, areas in which decisions are implemented are finances, programmes and human resources, with information systems to assist with this.

Research in the area of finance has evolved along the lines of practical and applied orientated research and policy orientated research. Policy orientated research tended to be associated with resource allocation and practically orientated research. Literature in the area of resource allocation focuses on financing by the state[15] and internal financial management allocation, which stressed general financial management strategies of institutions, and the state.[16]

---

[14] Peterson, M.W. & Mets, L.A. (1987). Chapter One: An Evolutionary Perspective on Academic Governance, Management, and Leadership. In *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership; A Guide to the Literature.* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. p.3-4.

[15] Also see Bowen, H.R. (1977). *Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Bowen, H.R. (1980). *The Costs of Higher Education: How Much Do Colleges and Universities Spend per Student and How Much Should They Spend?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Breneman, D.W.& Nelson, S.C. (1981).*Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1975). *Low or No Tuition: The Feasibility of a National Policy for the First Two Years of College.* San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.
Hoy, C.J. & Bernstein, M.H.(Eds.). (1982). *inancing Higher Education: Public Investment.* Boston: Auburn House.
Tuckman, H.P. & Whalen, E. (Eds.). (1980). *Subsidies to Higher Education: The Issues.* New York: Praeger.
Wattenbarger, J.L. & Cage, B.N. (1974). *More Money for More Opportunity: Financial Support of Community College Systems.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[16] Anderson, R.E. (1983). *Finance and Effectiveness: A Study of College Environments.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.
Carter, E.E. (1980). *College Financial Management.* Lexington, M.A: Lexington Books.
Harcleroad, F.F. (Ed.). (1979). *Financing Post Secondary Education in the 1980s.* Tucson, A.R: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
Leslie, L.L. (Ed.).(1984). *Responding to New Realities in Funding.* New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The literature also considers other general financial matters[17] such as shifting the role of business managers from administration to entrepreneurial teams.

During the 1960s and 1970s, through the initiative of the Carnegie Policy studies, a number of studies focusing on the effectiveness and quality of academic programmes emerged. The literature in this area focuses on programme planning[18] which entails management control over the expansion of the

---

Lohmann, R.A. (1980).*Breaking Even: Financial Management in Human Service Organisations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Allen, R.H. & Brinkman, P.T. (1983). *How to Improve Financial Operations: Marginal Costing Techniques for Higher Education*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
Gamso, G. (1978). *An Approach to Cost Studies in Small Colleges.* Boulder, CO: National Centre for Higher Education Management Systems.
Gonyea, M.A. (Ed.). (1978). *Analysing and Constructing Cost.* New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Levin, H.M. (1983). *Cost Effectiveness, A Primer*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
National Association of College and University Business Officers. (1980). *Costing for Policy Analysts*. Washington DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

[17] Campbell, D.F. (Ed.). (1985). Strengthening *Financial Management.* New Directions for Community Colleges: No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Caruthers, J.K. & Orwig, M.D. (1979). Budgeting *in Higher Education.* AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report: No. 3. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
Coldren, S.L. (1982). The *Constant Quest: Raising Billions Through Capital Campaigns.* Washington DC: American Council of Education.
Falender, A.J. & Merson, J.C. (Eds.). (1983). Management *Techniques for Small and Specialised Institutions.* New Directions for Higher Education: No. 42. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Hopkins, D.S.P. & Massy, W.F. (1981). *Planning Models for Colleges and University*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Pray, F. C. (Ed.). (1981). *Handbook for Educational Fund Raising: A Guide to Successful Principles and Practices for Colleges, Universities and Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Scheps, C. & Davidson, E.E. (1978). Accounting *for Colleges and Universities.* (3rd ed.). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

[18] Armijo, F. (1980). *Comprehensive Institutional Planning: Studies in Implementation*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
Bergquist, W. H., et al. (1981). Designing *Undergraduate Education: A Systematic Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Conrad, C. F. (1978). The *Undergraduate Curriculum: A Guide to Innovation and Reform*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Heydinger, R. B. (1980). *Planning Academic Programs.* In Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson and Associates, *Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

curriculum through, for example programming, planning and budgeting systems (PPBS). The latter is a phenomenon of the 1970s in which academic planning is viewed as a product line in business; program development[19] which entails the process of updating and improving academic programmes and programme evaluation[20] and considers the review or assessment of students, programmes and institutions with the focus upon outcomes. However, this literature is fairly limited with little theory development.[21]

Human resource development, previously known as personnel administration, became a formal field after 1969. Human resource development is concerned with the complex issues of legislative, faculty and staff increases. Human resource development strives to ensure consistency in a policy in a period of change in higher education. This goes beyond personnel administration which entailed, for example, making decisions pertaining to pay scales or sick leave. Human resource development is concerned with faculty development,[22]

Mayhew, L. B. (1970). *Curriculum Construction and Planning*. In Asa S. Knowles (Ed.), *Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[19] Chickering, A. W., et al. (1977). Developing *the College Curriculum: A Handbook for Faculty and Administrators*. Washington DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.
Dressel, P.L. (1971). College *and University Curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

[20] Adelman, C. (1986). Assessment *in American Higher Education*. Washington DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S Department of Education.
Alm, K., et al. (1976). Program *Evaluation*. Washington DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
Craven, E. (Ed.). (1980). Academic *Program Evaluation* New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Miller, R.I. (1979). *The Assessment of College Performance: A Handbook of Techniques and Measures for Institutional Self-Evaluations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[21] Barak, R. J. (n.d.). Chapter 10 Program Planning, Development and Evaluation, p. 222.

[22] Also see Baldwin, R.G. (Ed.). (1985). Incentives *for Faculty Vitality*. New Directions for Higher Education: No. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Centra, J. A. (1978). Types of Faculty Development Programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 49 (2).
Chait, R. P. & Gueths, J. (1981). Proposing a Framework for Faculty Development. *Change,* 13 (4).
Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Licata, C. M. (1986). *Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation: Threat or Opportunity*. AAHE-

administrative development[23] and support service development.[24] Faculty development has evolved from the 1960s and 1970s when programmes focused on assisting faculty to public and instructional development to the mid 1980s when there were concerns with acclimatising faculty with new markets, technology, productivity, faculty workload and post tenure reviews.[25]

Information technology is used within higher education as a decision support service and most of the literature in this area relates expertise of its application to higher education[26] and therefore tends to be practically orientated.[27]

ERIC Higher Education Research Report: No. 1. Washington DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

[23] Fisher, C.F. & Coll-Pardo, I. (Eds.). (1979). Guide *to Leadership Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators.* Washington DC: American Council of Education.
Fortunato, R.T. & Keiser, D.W. (1985). *Human Resource Development in Higher Education Institutions.* Washington DC: *College and University Personnel Association.*
Knowles, M.S. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education.* Chicago: Association Press.

[24] Carnevale, A.P. & Goldstein, H. (1983). Employee *Training: Its Changing Role and an Analysis of New Data*. Washington DC: American Society for Training and Development.
Knowles, M. S. (1986). Using *Learning Contracts: Practical Approaches to Individualising and Structuring Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Nadler, L. (1982). Designing *Training Programs: The Critical Events Model.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

[25] Fortunato, R.T., et al. (n.d.). *Chapter 11 Human Resource Development and Personnel Administration*, p. 238-246.

[26] McCredie, J.W. (Ed.). (1983). *Campus Computing Strategies*. Bedford, MA: Digital Press. .
Mason, T.R. (Ed.). (1976). *Assessing Computer-Based System Models*. New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 9. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[27] Also see Hopkins, D.S.P. & Massy, W.F. (1981). Planning *Models for Colleges and Universities*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Moore, L.J. & Greenwood, A.G. (1984). Decision *Support Systems for Academic Administration.* AIR Professional File, No. 18. Tallahassee: Association for Institutional Research, Florida State University.
Sprague, R.H. Jr. & Carlson, E.D. (1982). *Building Effective Decision Support Systems.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
Glover, R.H. (1986). Designing *a Decision Support System for Enrollment Management.* Research in Higher Education.
Rohrbaugh, J. & McCartt, A.T. (Eds.) (1986). Applying *Decision Support Systems in Higher Education. New Directions in Institutional Research*, No. 49. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Other literature includes policy analysis[28] and institutional research[29] and entails research on the formation, implementation, analysis and evaluation of institutional policy. Research on innovation[30] and planned change focuses upon how institutions can respond practically and systematically to changing demands in their internal and external environments through suggesting various planned change models.[31] There have been attempts to improve academic effectiveness[32]

---

28 Fincher, C. (1973). The *Purpose and Functions of Policy in Higher Education.* Athens: Institute of Higher Education. Athens. University of Georgia.

29 Balderston, F.E. & Weathersby, G.B. (1973). PPBS in Higher Education Planning and Management: Part III, Perspectives and Applications of Policy Analysis. *Higher Education,* 2(1), 33-67.
Bowen, H.R. (1982). *The State of the Nation and the Agenda for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1977). *Priorities for Action*: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

30 Lindquist, J. (1974). Political Linkage: The Academic-Innovation Process. *Journal of Higher Education,* 45. 323-343.
Nordvall, R.C. (1982). *The Process of Change in Higher Education Institutions.* AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report: No. 7. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.

31 Baldridge, J.V. (1971). *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York: Wiley.
Baldridge, J.V. (1972). Organisational Change: The Human Relations, Perspective Versus the Political Systems Perspective. *Educational Researcher,* 1 (4), 10 & 15. Dill, D.D. & Friedman, C.P. (1979). Analysis of Frameworks for Research on Innovation and Change in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 49 (3), 411-435.
Lindquist, J. (1978). *Strategies for Change*. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings Press.

32 Bare, A.C. (1980). The Study of Academic Department Performance. *Research in Higher Education,* 12, 3-22.
Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. (1977). Administrator Effectiveness: The Effects of Advocacy and Information on Achieving Outcomes in an Organisational Context. *Human Relations,* 30, 641-656.
Cameron, K. S. (1986). A Study of Organisational Effectiveness and its Predictors. *Management Science,* 32(1), 87-112.
Cameron, K. S. & Whetten, D. A. (1983). *Organisational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models*. Orlando, Flanders: Academic Press.
Goodman, P. S., Pennings, J. M. & Associates. (1977). *New Perspectives on Organisational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organisations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

and quality[33] at different levels such as departmental, unit, institutional, different time frames - long term or short term, from different perspectives - students, administrators and different purposes - for academic research and different references - to establish constituency demands or institutional performances. The reason for this diversification is that there are different ways of defining universities and how they reach decisions, whether through collegiums, hierarchies, political arenas, organised anarchies, loosely coupled systems or professional bureaucracies. Managing enrolments and revenue has focused on the causes and strategies[34] for responding to decline, organisational dynamics[35] as a consequence of decline and management cutback strategies.[36] Lastly, there is a

---

[33] Pace, C. R. (1979). *Measuring Outcomes of College: Fifty Years of Findings and Recommendations for the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Astin, A. W. & Solomon, L. C. (1981). Are Reputational Ratings Needed to Measure Quality? *Change,* 13(7), 14-19.
Lawrence, J. K. & Green, K. C. (1980). *A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game.* AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report: No. 5. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
Webster, D. S. (1981). Advantages and Disadvantages of Methods of Assessing Quality. *Change,* 13.
Conrad, C. F. & Blackburn, R.T. (1985). Program Quality in Higher Education: A Review and Critique of Literature and Research. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research.* Vol.1. New York: Agathon.

[34] Bowen, F. M. & Glenny, L. A. (1980). *Uncertainty in Public Higher Education: Responses to Stress at Ten California Colleges and Universities*. Sacramento: California Post Secondary Education Committee.
Levine, C. H. (1978). Organisational Decline and Cutback Management. *Public Administration Review,* 38, 316-325.
Mortimer, K. P. & Tierney, M. L. (1979). *The Three R's of the Eighties: Reduction, Reallocation, and Retrenchments.* AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report: No. 4. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.
Petrie, H. G. & Alpert, D. (1983). What is the Problem of Retrenchment in Higher Education? *Journal of Management Studies*, 20, 97-119.

[35] Behn, R. D. (1980). Leadership for Cut-Back Management: The Use of Corporate Strategy. *Public Administration Review*, 40, 613-620.
Chaffee, E. E. (1984). Successful Strategic Management in Small Private Colleges. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55 (2), 212-241.
Rubine, I. (1977). Universities in Stress: Decision Making Under Conditions of Reduced Resources. *Social Science Quarterly*, 58, 242-254.

[36] Hyatt, J. A., et al. (1984). *Reallocation: Strategies for Effective Resource Management*. Washington DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.
Mingle, J.R. & Associates. (1981). *Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources*. San Francisco:

body of literature on managing equity and affirmative action[37]and what managers do.[38] More specifically, Birnbaum (2000) discusses the various management techniques such as Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS), Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB), Management by Objectives (MBO), Strategic Planning, Total Quality Management/Continuous Quality Improvement (TQM/CQI), Business Process Reengineering (BPR) and Benchmarking. Birnbaum argues that in each instance these are management techniques, which are adopted by higher education institutions post their implementation and failure in the business environment.[39]

As can be seen, therefore, there is a voluminous, growing body of literature on management in higher education. The reason for this is that, although initially higher education institutions were established in the framework of the nation state, they managed to rise above the nation state and to keep a degree of relative independence from the state and society. In doing so they have been some of the most resilient organisations to the point that Neave (2001) has referred to universities as "establishments".[40] However, over the past two or three decades

---

Jossey-Bass.
Zammuto, R.F. (1986). Managing Decline in American Higher Education. In: John C. Smart (Ed.). (1986). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. 2. New York: Agathon.

37 Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1975). *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education: An Analysis of Institutional and Federal Policies with Recommendations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Exum, W. H. (1983). Climbing the Crystal Stair: Values, Affirmative Action, and Minority Faculty. *Social Problem,* 30(4), 383-399.
Hitt, M. (1983). Affirmative Action Effectiveness Criteria in Institutions of Higher Education. *Research in Higher Education,* 18 (2), 391-408.
Hyer, P. B. (1985). Affirmative Action for Women Faculty: Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions. *Journal of Higher Education,* 56 (3), 282-299.

38 Alvarez, R. & Echevin, C. (2000). Describing the work of University Managers: The Case of the Venezuelan University. *Higher Education Management,* 12(3), 97-113.

39 Birnbaum, R. (2000). The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 1-16.
Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management Fads in Higher Education: Where They Come From, What They Do, Why They Fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

40 Neave, G. (2001). Paper presented at the International Higher Education PhD seminar series of CHEPS at the University of Twente, Netherlands.

there has been massive change affecting all higher education institutions, including established institutions such as the University of Oxford. As a consequence, there has been a proliferation of new literature in higher education management. One of the most compelling questions in the literature is what this study is concerned with: the changing nature of management. While management itself is not viewed as an area of contention, its changing nature and associated relations of power and authority are major developments over the past few decades.

2.3 'Managerialism': Discourse, Techniques and Organisational Form

'Managerialism' is a particular mode of management change and is also referred to as: 'corporate managerialism', 'new managerialism', 'public management' and 'academic managerialism'. Different aspects of managerialism may be emphasised, such as 'the right to manage' or managerialism as an ideology[41] or 'strong faith'[42] and managerialism as a set of techniques imported from the private to public sector.[43]

The idea that managerialism is the 'right to manage' establishes that managers, as opposed to other interest groups such as unions, are regarded as imposing restrictive practices, are better able to manage organisations and therefore should be given 'the freedom to make decisions about the use of organisational resources

---

41 Pollitt, cited in Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. p. 56.

42 Krantz, cited in Fitzsimons, P. (2000). Managerialism *and Education*. http://www.vusst.hr/ENCYCLOPAEDIA/managerialism.htm. p. 1-6.

43 Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 8(1), 49.

to achieve desired outcomes'.[44] Managerialism's predominant concern is with economic rationalism, which refers to an unrelenting faith in market economics in all areas of life, public and private.[45] This ideology gives power to managers and erodes the power of other interest groups and suggests that organisations are unable to exist without a distinct group of full time managers. By creating a layer of full time managers, managerialism infringes upon collective decision making and culture.[46] However, Meyer (2002) regards managerialism as likely to be around for some time to come and therefore needs to be confronted from the perspective of organisational learning so that organisations can gain from managerialism.[47]

Clarke and Newman (1997) present ten 'principles' of managing as part of the discourse of change which tends to demonise the past while claiming a visionary and idealistic future.

---

44 Pollitt, cited in Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd. p.56- 57.

45 Bessant, B. (1995). Corporate management and its penetration of university administration and government. *Australian Universities' Review,* 1(59), 59- 62.

46 Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 106.

47 Meyer, H. (2002). The new managerialism in education management: corporatisation or organisational learning? *Journal of Educational Administration,* 40(6), 534-551.

2.3.1 The Discourse of Change[48]

The table below captures the discourse of change. This discourse, in significant ways discussed below, frames the way in which management is thought of.

Table 1: The Discourse of Change

Present	**Past**
Steering	Rowing
Empowering	Serving communities
Funding outcomes	Inputs
Meeting the needs of customers	Bureaucracy
Earning	Spending
Prevention	Cure
Participation	Hierarchy

While in the past the emphasis was on close supervision and control and the role of powerful agencies in addressing community needs, the emphasis now is on individuals addressing their own needs and actively participating in such processes. The shift is essentially from collective to individual responsibility and therefore requiring management to play more of a 'hands off' role.

Managerial techniques include: creating a strategic plan; establishing new decision making structures; centralising power within the top leadership[49] while

decentralising budgets; establishing closer collaboration with industry; emphasising surveillance technology; introducing management training programmes;[50] establishing internal cost centres; fostering competition between employees; introducing performance appraisal techniques;[51] altering the culture and values of the organisation;[52] marketising and commodifying services and monitoring efficiency and effectiveness.[53]

The new discourse and techniques are intimately related to establishing new organisational structures and processes. Organisational theory and related concepts such as 'organisational fields' and 'isomorphism' developed by DiMaggio and Powell permeate the literature as most plausible explanations. 'Organisational field' refers to organisations that produce similar goods and services and 'isomorphism'[54] describes the tendency for organisations within a

---

48 Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd. p. 49.

49 Blackmore, J. (2002). Globalisation and the Restructuring of Higher Education for New Knowledge Economies: New Dangers or Old Habits Troubling Gender Equity Work in Universities? *Higher Education Quarterly,* 56(4), 426- 427.

50 Webster, E. & Mosoetsa, S. (2001). *At the Chalk Face: Managerialism and the changing Academic Workplace, 1995-2001.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the South African Sociological Association. UNISA, Pretoria.

51 Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 49.

52 Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education,* 37(1), 10 -11.

53 Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 8(1), 50.

54 'Isomorphism' is defined as a population ecology approach as it emphasises selection as opposed to adaptation. Selection here means natural selection in which organisations which are the most successful are able to survive and hence organisations are most likely to follow other organisations within a given organisational field that is successful (Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. (1995). *Work Organisations: A Critical Introduction.* (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Press Ltd. p. 69-71.).

similar field to resemble each other.[55] Given the significance of resource allocation upon the lives of organisations, resource dependency theory, a variant of organisational theory, is most extensively drawn on as it suggests that internal actions and behaviours of organisations can best be understood with reference to: (i) external agencies' behaviours which impact upon the organisation because of their resource allocation to organisations; (ii) the extent to which the organisation has power to make decisions pertaining to resources; and (iii) the organisation's access to alternative resources.[56]

The responsiveness of organisations is evident in Reed's (2002) definition of managerialism as an alternative institutional and organisational theory to the bureau-professionalism model critiqued for its 'lack of accountability, internal managerial discipline and routine operational efficiency'. Bureau-professionalism is a traditional order, which is based on a combination of professional[57] and administrative[58] relations, each based on hierarchical relations inhibiting organisations' responsiveness to market forces.[59] Managerialism is legitimised through contrasting it with the past, that is, bureaucracy as represented in Table 2.

---

55 Hoggett, P. (1996). New modes of control in the public service. *Public Administration*, 94, 16-17.

56 Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (1999). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. p. 68-69.
Pfeffer, J. & Salanck, G.R. (1978). *The External Control of Organisations: A Resource Dependency Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

57 Professionalism is based on hierarchical relations within and between professions.

58 Administration is based on functionally specific identities and hierarchies between grades and status positions.

59 Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd. p. 68.
Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 50.

Table 2: How Managerialism is Legitimised[60]

Bureaucracy is:	*Managerialism* is:
Rule bound	Innovative
Inward looking	Externally oriented
Compliance centred	Performance centred
Ossified	Dynamic
Professionalism is:	*Management* is:
Paternalist	Customer centred
Mystique ridden	Transparent
Standard oriented	Results oriented
Self-regulating	Market tested
Politicians are:	*Managers* are:
Dogmatic	Pragmatic
Interfering	Enabling
Unstable	Strategic

Market based managerialism makes organisations more responsive to the markets by breaking simultaneously the power of professionals or elites and bureaucratic rigidities. It replaces bureaucratic hierarchies with networks of 'purchasers and providers', while subjecting professionals to internal and external managerial regulation and control.[61]

Hogget (1996) points out the inter-relation between the features of organisational change, which signify a hybridisation of bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic organisational form or 'flawed post-bureaucratic' form based upon two sets of contradictions. Firstly, the coexistence of the contradictory process of

---

60 Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd. p. 65.

61 Deem, M.I. (2002). New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities: A Review and Assessment. In A. Amaral, et al. (Eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance.* p. 163 – 170.

centralisation or regulation of policy at meso and micro levels and the decentralisation or self-management and autonomy evident in devolution and financial management. Secondly, the contradiction between less formalisation suggested by post-bureaucratic theory through the promotion of networks and teams and the extension of greater levels of formalisation evident through performance appraisal technologies. A hybrid form would be a combination of the old and new organisational forms as represented in Table 3.

Table 3: Hybridisation of Bureaucratic and Post-bureaucratic Organisation[62]

Old	**New**
Stability	Disorganisation/chaos
Rationality	Charisma, values
Planning	Spontaneity
Control	Empowerment
Command	Participation
Centralisation	Decentralisation/disaggregation
Hierarchy	Network
Formal	Informal/flexibility
Large	Downsized/delayered

He further discusses the effects of markets and competition upon the public service as: decentralised units taking on the form of small medium public

[62] Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. (1995). *Work Organisations: A Critical Introduction.* (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Press Ltd. p. 167.

enterprises, the fragmentation of traditional lateral solidarities and public service employees increasingly adopting the discourse and culture of competition.[63]

These practices are internalised within institutions such as universities through, for example, the core/non-core framework. The core is understood as that part of the organisation that is central to what makes the organisation distinct from other organisations, and non-core are services, operations and processes which play a supportive role but are not necessarily central to what the organisation does. The discourse of core/non-core has been used by the private sector to streamline and downsize organisational operations. The thinking here is that organisations need to be more responsive and flexible to rapid changes within their environment. There are no differences from the developments that are taking place throughout both the public and private sector. Companies argue that they should focus on their core business and design the periphery in a far more 'flexible' manner.

The implication of this is that the external and internal boundaries or the 'core and the non-core' of organisations are being redrawn, which in turn brings into question employment contracts, location of work and work rules.[64] Thompson and McHugh (1995) indicate that Atkinson's flexible firm model provides a useful analytical framework from which to understand the approach of employers to change the conditions and location of workers. The model amplifies the break with hierarchical labour markets and new internal arrangements of allocating labour to create a core workforce and a cluster of peripheral employment relations.[65]

---

[63] Hoggett, P. (1996). New modes of control in the public service. *Public Administration*, 94, 9-32.

[64] Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. (1995). *Work Organisations: A Critical Introduction.* (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Press Ltd. p.173 - 174.

[65] Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. (1995). *Work Organisations: A Critical Introduction.* (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Press Ltd. p.173 - 174.

2.3.2 Implications of Organisational Change for Managerial Change

These changes in the nature of organisations have a number of implications for the changing nature of management. Firstly, professional and management personnel are expected to accept the new universal discourse.[66] Secondly, the emphasis on managers has the danger of encouraging class consciousness among managers as a consequence of their common training programmes.[67] The development of common management programmes suggests that management is context and product free. They are 'generic managers' who could simply move across various public sector organisations and implement similar packages.[68] As Parker (2002) states, "…it is the application of a narrow conception of management as a generalised technology of control to everything – horses, humans and hospitals".[69] At a global level they are a 'transnational class'[70]. Thirdly, policy is viewed as the domain of managers, and implementation of decisions the domain of workers. This is a separation of conception and execution.[71] Fourthly, the organisation

---

66 Deem, M.I. (2002). New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities: A Review and Assessment. In A. Amaral, et al. (Eds.). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance.* p.168.

67 Fitzsimons, P. (2000). Managerialism *and Education.* http://www.vusst.hr/ENCYCLOPAEDIA/managerialism.htm, p.1 - 6.

68 Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). Collegiality*, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of New England, Armadale.

69 Parker, M. (2002). Against *Management:Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. p.11.

70 Cited in Currie, J. (2001). *Globalisation and Internationalisation in Australian, European and United States Universities.* Paper Presented at the SAARDHE. South Africa. p. 20.

71 Bessant, B. (1988). Corporate management and the institutions of higher education. *Australian Universities' Review,* 2, 10, 59- 62.

requires a hierarchy of managers and growth in management with the general manager at its peak.[72]

Current managerial changes are characteristic of Scientific Management or Taylorism. Scientific Management entails: (i) the process of disconnecting the labour process from the skills of the worker; (ii) breaking the unity of the labour process by separating thinking from doing, 'the separation of head and hand'; and (iii) using the knowledge expropriated from workers to control each step within the labour process.

The consequence of this would be increasing degradation of work, the growth in 'unproductive workers', professionalisation of managers/academic managers[73] and the growth in management hierarchies in areas such as advertising and marketing.[74] 'The separation of head and hand' through introducing full time managements, the growth in the managerial layer through appointing more full time managers[75] and attempts to gain greater control over academics' work through performance appraisal, are characteristic of attempts to gain greater control over labour time.

Braverman argues in "Labor and Monopoly Capital" that capital needs to extract maximum returns from workers' labour time[76] by expropriating the knowledge of

---

72 Bessant, B. (1988). Corporate management and the institutions of higher education. *Australian Universities' Review,* 2, 10, 59- 62.
Parker, M. (2002). Against *Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. p. 11.

73 Moodie, G. (1995). The professionalisation of Australian academic administration. *Australian Universities' Review*, 1, 21- 23.

74 Brown, R.K. (1992). *Understanding Industrial Organisations: Theoretical Perspectives in Industrial Sociology*. Routledge, London. p. 186-187.
Gornitzka, A. & Larsen, I.M. (2004). Towards professionalisation? Restructuring of administrative work force in universities. *Higher Education,* 47, 455-471.

75 Parker, M. (2002). Against *Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. p. 11.

76 The idea behind labour time here is that what the capitalist buys is not a specific amount of labour but labour power or the potential to work, thus acquiring the most effective use of that labour power.

workers and vesting it in management. This is referred to as Scientific Management or Taylorism. It allows management to gain control of the labour process.

> It thus becomes essential for the capitalist that control over the labor process pass from the hands of the worker into his own. This transition presents itself in history as the progressive alienation of the process of production from the worker to the capitalist; it presents itself as the problem of management.[77]

Put differently,

> There can be few bodies of knowledge, and few professions that contribute so assiduously to the general debilitation of those who are their object of interest. Yet in the market place of management knowledge, the one criterion by which knowledge claims are judged, approved and adopted is precisely their ability to intensify labour, even though this is rarely explicit…The conviction that labour intensification is appropriate and necessary implies a specific belief that labour is not yet producing, in the Taylorist sense, a fair day's work for a fair day's pay…The production of management knowledge is not informed by a sense of how much work needs to be done and what resources are available to do it, nor by a sense of efficiency as a means to an end, but by the assumption that efficiency is an end in itself.[78]

While Parker (2002) does not question the need for management as he concurs that processes need to be organised he questions whether full time managers are needed and whether such extensive layers of managers are required.[79]

The domination of managers through the discourse, techniques and organisational form implicates power. Commonly throughout managerial literature Foucault's notion of power, governmentality and the notion of the panopticon is drawn on to conceptualise the power of managers through the domination of official

---

77 Brown, R.K. (1992). *Understanding Industrial Organisations: Theoretical Perspectives in Industrial Sociology*. London: Routledge. p. 184.

78 Jackson & Carter (1998). cited in Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). Collegiality*, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of New England, Armadale. p. 41.

79 Parker, M. (2002). A*gainst Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

knowledge or truth[80] over 'subjugated knowledge',[81] the technologies of surveillance and the pervasive internalisation of managerialism.[82] Foucault allows one to understand how individuals come to internalise official knowledge and as a consequnce become prisoners of their own thoughts.

2.4 The Rationale for Changing Management Practices in Higher Education

Different perspectives on the rationale for the changing management practices in higher education institutions exist. There are those such as Slaughter and Leslie and Shumar[83] and still others[84] who critique these changes and argue that they are caused by the changes in capitalism evident in national systems, institutional

---

80 Faubion, J.D. (2002). *Michel Foucault power Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* Volume 3. England: Penguin Books. p. 131-132.

81 McHoul, A. & Grace, W. (1993). A *Foucault Primer: Discourse, power and the subject.* New York: New York University Press. p. 16–17.

82 Ball, J. S. (2001). The *teacher's soul and the terror of performativity.* http://www.lhs.se/atee/proceedings/Ball._Key_note.
Hoggett, P. (1996). New modes of control in the public service. *Public Administration*, 94, 9-32.

83 Shumar, W. (1997). *College for Sale: A Critique of the Commodification of Higher Education.* London: Falmer Press.

84 Ovetz, R. (1996). Turning Resistance into Rebellion: Student struggles and the global entrepreneurialisation of the universities. *Capital & Class.* p. 115.
Bertlesen, E. (1998). The Real Transformation: The Marketisation of Higher Education. *Social Dynamics,* 24 (2), 130-158.
Noble notes that with the involvement of multinational corporations such as IBM, Apple, Bell, Microsoft and the production of CD-ROMS, copyrighted videos, courseware and websites, the business of information technology is a several hundred billion dollar industry with higher education institutions marked as a 'focus industry'. Noble further points out that the danger of this new automated form of learning is that academics are threatened with deskilled labour, as these companies study what and how they teach on-line for the purposes of repackaging information and are required to be continually accessible both to administrators and to students. Students too are vulnerable to exploitation as they pay more for less (Noble, D.F. (1998). Digital Diploma Mills: The automation of Higher Education. *Monthly Review*. 42-43).

systems and even regional trade agreements.[85] There are also those such as Clarke (1998) who promotes the 'entrepreneurial university'.[86]

Whether detractors or promoters of the entrepreneurial university or academic capitalism, economic factors are regarded as primary. Economic factors mentioned include: globalisation, the capitalist economic crisis of profitability and the declining financial contribution of the state[87] to higher education. This leads to increasing competition between higher education institutions, a focus upon their 'competitive edge'[88] even when fostering collaborative relations,[89] the introduction of a flexible organisational regime as democratic decision making is regarded as being far too cumbersome,[90] changes within the internal organisational regime, which include the commodification of knowledge, underpinned by the drive from mode one to mode two knowledge or from theoretical to practical knowledge.[91]

---

85 Abiotes, H. (2002). Globalisation and the transformation of the Mexican university in Midnight Notes. Email conversation.

86 Clarke, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities*. Britain, Surrey: International Association of Universities.

87 Orr, L. (1997). Globalisation and Universities: Towards the "Market University"? *Social Dynamics*, 23(1).

88 Benjamin, R. & Carroll, S. J. (1996). Impediments and Imperatives in Restructuring Higher Education. *Educational Administrative Quarterly,* 32, 710 – 71.
Clarke, G. (1997). Reassessing resource allocation strategies in higher education: methods for analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(6), 1-8.

89 Gibbons, M. (2001). *Globalisation in higher education: the tension between collaboration and competition.* Paper presented at the South African Association for Research and Development in Higher Education (SAARDHE) in conjunction with the University of the Free State.

90 De Boer, H., et al. (1998). On Boards and Councils; Shaky Balances: the governance of Dutch universities. *Higher Education Policy,* 11(2/3), 153-164.

91 Ramarez, F. O. (2004). *The Rationalisation of Universities*. Paper presented at a research seminar in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. To be published in Marie-Laure Djelic and Kerstin Shalin-Andersson, (Eds.). Transnational Relations, C.U.P.

Others such as Deem (1998) argue that far too much consideration is given to global factors and focusing upon what is similar without sufficient attention to the local or what is peculiar. Deem suggests that this requires methodological intervention, which takes into account the global-local axis.[92]

Explanations tend to be tilted either towards the economic crisis or towards the massification[93] thesis, or the focus upon building the nation state as argued by Readings (1996).[94] Recognising this, Ramirez (2004) argues that it is not only economic factors or capitalism that account for the rationalisation of higher education, but also social movements and populist forces that have fought for the massification or equal access, democratisation and social relevance of higher education institutions, and organisational flexibility, usefulness and accessibility entrenched within the Bologna Declaration.[95] Social movements fight for various aspects of social justice, identity, human rights and democracy, as has been evident in South Africa[96] where higher education institutions have striven towards playing a role in building democracy.

---

92 Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 8(1), 49.

93 Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 95-110.

94 Readings, B. (1996). The University in Ruins. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Marginson, drawing upon Reading's notion of the decline of higher education as a consequence of the decline of the nation state, argues that Australian higher education institutions are in a better position to compete globally. This would be possible only if they do not ignore the national context and their nation state and develop a distinct Australian contribution to higher education globally (Marginson, S. (2002). Nation-building universities in a global environment: The case of Australia. *Higher Education*, 43, 409-428).

95 Ramirez, F. O. (2004). *The Rationalisation of Universities*. Paper presented at a research seminar in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. To be published in Marie-Laure Djelic and Kerstin Shalin-Andersson, (Eds.). Transnational Relations, C.U.P.

96 Cross, M., et al. (Eds.). (1998). *Diversity and Unity: The Role of Higher Education in Building Democracy* Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

The consequence has been the development of larger institutions in which the old principles of the small paternalistic or familial university of elites cannot apply. The growth in the size of the institution leads to greater pressure on the institution to find alternative sources of funding and this requires more bureaucracy and managers to assist in managing the much larger organisation.[97] These social concerns which too have propelled changes within higher education institutions is what leads Ramirez (2004) to refer to universities affected by these changes as 'socially embedded'. In so doing, Ramirez (2004) points to establishing specificity beyond acknowledgements of the global or universal trends.

This was relevant for Europe and is also relevant for South Africa. In the South African context, both the economic and social impulse led by the mass democratic movement has been refracted through institutionalised racism of higher education. The contradiction is that institutions, while under pressure to respond to market forces, are also under pressure to demonstrate publicly that they are transforming with respect to the curriculum, access and student and staff composition.[98] It is perceived that this requires increasing bureaucratic layers demanded by institutionalised state regulation.

One cannot explain the changes taking place within the narrow framework of managerialism because institutions are struggling to manage the tension between social justice and economic rationality and trying to find some way of reconciling the two.

---

97 Ramirez, F. O. (2004). The *Rationalisation of Universities*. Paper presented at a research seminar in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. To be published in Marie-Laure Djelic & Kerstin Shalin-Andersson, (Eds.). Transnational Relations, C.U.P.
Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 95-110.

98 A case study of Rand Afrikaans University (RAU), historically a white university established for white working class Afrikaans students, discusses how RAU transformed its student composition because of market forces. This signals that market forces can ironically be significant in working towards the goals of social justice (Bolsmann, C. & Uys, T. (2001). Pre-empting the challenges of transformation and marketisation of higher education: a case study of the Rand Afrikaans University. *Society in Transition*, 32(2), 173-185).

2.5 Modes of Management in Higher Education Institutions

Given the current changing nature of management in higher education, studies that consider the mode of management include consideration of modes of governance.

Three distinct modes of governance have historically been evident in higher education institutions: the 'Continental', 'United Kingdom' and 'United States' modes.[99] While the Continental model is a combination of power of the state bureaucracy over individual institutions and the power of faculty in their pursuit of intellectual interests, in the United Kingdom and United States modes authority rests with the individual institutions and academia, with this authority being less in the United States.[100] The Continental model exhibits greater levels of state control.

The Continental model has two variants: the German or Humboldtian system focusing on research and the French or Napoleonic model focusing on teaching.[101] In both instances the state determines for example 'student admissions, the validation of courses and diplomas, the size of the academic staff, and the formal structures of internal management and governance'. The smallest unit and the most powerful unit of academic administration is the chair holding professor, who is both the intellectual and administrative leader granted a tenured position and bestowed privileges and resources directly by the state. The chair holding position is based upon personal authority with minimal checks via collegiality or bureaucratic control.

---

99 De Groof, Neave and Svec caution by stating that these distinctions or archetypes are based upon degrees of difference as perceived by scholars working on higher education governance during the 1980s (De Groof, J., et al. (1998). *Democracy and Governance in Higher Education.* The Hague, The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International. p. 12).

100 De Groof, J., et al. (1998). *Democracy and Governance in Higher Education.* The Hague, The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International. p. 12.

101 Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 95-110.

The next level is the faculty, an advisory group consisting of the entire chair holding professors and chaired by the dean elected for a short term with limited authority. Faculties address allocation of resources and selection of new professors. However, while the chair holding professor has power, fellow chair holders exert minimum influence. The institutional level of administration consists of the council in which the state makes representation to the university and the senate responsible for establishing academic guidelines. Both structures consist of deans of the faculties and representatives of other groups.[102]

The United Kingdom and United States models are referred to as the Anglo-Saxon model. Public universities in Britain, Ireland, Canada and North America, for example, are essentially private institutions because of the lack of state interference in these institutions.[103] Particularly in the case of the UK, the institution is based on collegial or 'clan' control, made possible through an elitist higher education system consisting, until the beginning of the 19th century, of Oxford and Cambridge. In this instance, the smallest level of academic administration is the disciplinary based department with a professor as head, appointed for life. Collective decision making is practised because of the existence of many subject based professors in a single department. With the degree structure being single subject orientated, resources are directed to the department. Department chairs too exist at this level. They are responsible for the allocation of resources whether research or teaching related and the recruitment of staff. The second level of academic administration is at faculty level and is referred to as the faculty board, with the dean, a professor appointed for a short period and who is also the chair of the faculty board.

---

[102] Dill, D.D. (2001). Reading One: Academic Administration In D.D. Dill. (Ed.).*The Nature of Academic Organisation*. The Netherlands: Lemma Publishers. p. 12-15.

[103] Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2).

The third level of academic administration, referred to as the triad, consists of the Vice-chancellor, council and senate with: the council, representative of external interests and responsible for finance, planning and maintenance; senate responsible for academic matters; and the VC responsible for coordinating diverse institutional interests, chairing senate and representing the university externally. Senate is composed of heads of departments, professors and elected representatives of non-professorial staff, while council is composed of a large group of local 'notables', staff and students.[104]

While similar in administrative structures, the United States (US) model differs from the UK model in its relationship with the nation state. The US is less based upon tradition and more upon market influences and entrepreneurial capacities of deans, chairs and university president (as opposed to VC in the British case) because of institutions' greater reliance upon mobilising non-state resources.[105]

The key distinction between Continental Europe and the Anglo-Saxon model is the role of the state within higher education. While in the former case institutions are subjected to state control,[106] with university autonomy non-existent and academic freedom strong, in the latter case university autonomy has been strong but academic freedom less pervasive and therefore academics are less powerful. Less state control improved the chances of institutions fostering stronger collegial relations or a "shared belief in the reliability of professional judgement".[107]

---

104 Dill, D.D.(2001). Reading One: Academic Administration In D.D.Dill. (Ed.).*The Nature of Academic Organisation*. The Netherlands: Lemma Publishers. p. 15-19.

105 Dill, D.D. (2001). Reading One: Academic Administration In D.D. Dill. (Ed.). *The Nature of Academic Organisation*. The Netherlands: Lemma Publishers. p.19-23.

106 Amaral, A. & Magalhaes, A. (2003). The Triple Crisis of the University and its Reinvention. *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 241-242.

107 Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 95-110.

While historically there may have been distinct modes of governance and management, the current trend is a unitary universal mode of higher education management, central to which is the question of institutional autonomy.[108]

> There has been a trend towards greater university autonomy in all European countries with a history of state control. Most European governments (with the exception of the United Kingdom) have implemented policies aimed at deregulating higher education. In the United Kingdom, Australia and the United Sates, where universities have traditionally been autonomous, on the other hand, governments are adopting more interventionist policies. Thus there is a clear trend towards convergence in university governing models.[109]

The rise of this universal mode, spurred on by the legitimacy[110] crisis of higher education, has been made possible through conceptualising universities not as 'social institutions' which are autonomous and protecting of education as a right as education is regarded as a social good, but as 'organisations' with administrative structures and informed by instrumentality.[111] Underpinning these relations have been institutional relations with the nation state with respect to demonstrating commitment to social justice and financial prudence. In South Africa this is starkly evident with the new funding formula, which emphasises teaching, research outputs and institutional factors such as racial composition, enrolment size of the institution and the kinds of programmes offered. The new subsidy formula is heavily focused on productivity; for example, PhDs earn more subsidy than do undergraduates.[112] The subsidy formula also introduces process control issues such as kinds of programmes and product

---

108 Mora, J.(2001).Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2), 95-110.

109 Mora, J. (2001). Governance and Management in the New University. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7(2),100.

110 The legitimacy crisis is one variant, the other crises are the hegemony and the institutional crisis. The legitimacy crisis is, however, the focus of the discussion in the article.

111 Amaral, A. & Magalhaes, A. (2003). The Triple Crisis of the University and its Reinvention. *Higher Education Policy*, 16, 239-253.
Gumport, P. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organisational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39, 67-91.

112 University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Draft Funding Framework, S2003/192, University Archives, Senate House, p.1-5.

control measures like performance and quality control.[113] All these are mechanisms through which institutional autonomy becomes conditional and in turn affect the extent to which academic autonomy and therefore collegiality can be protected, with increasing attention paid to financial resources. Clarke and Newman (1997) would regard this as being one of the features of the 'Managerial State', meaning that institutional behaviours are shaped by their relations to the state.

From Australia through the work of Currie (2001),[114] and Meek; from Europe through the work of de Boer and Goedgebuure (1998);[115] from the United States through the work of Keller (1983),[116] from the UK through the work of Trow (1994)[117] and Deem (1998);[118] from Canada through the work of Newson (1998);[119] from Hong Kong and Taiwan through the work of Mok and Lo[120] from Africa through the work of Court (2000)[121] from South Africa through the work of

---

113 A similar idea is expressed by Coughlan (Coughlan, F. (2004). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg: Executive Management of the University: Role of the Senior Executive Team (SET). Special Advisor to the Vice-Chancellor Ms Kashaini Maistry. p.5-6.

114 Currie, J. (2001). *Globalisation and Internationalisation in Australian, European and United States Universities.* Paper Presented at the SAARDHE. South Africa.

115 De Boer, H, et al. (1998). On Boards and Councils; Shaky Balances the governance of Dutch universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 11(2/3), 153-164.

116 Keller, G.(1983). *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

117 Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2), 11.

118 Deem, R. (1998). 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 47-70.

119 Newson, J. (1998). The Corporate-Linked University from Social Project to Market Force. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 23, 107-124.

120 Mok, J.K.H. & Lo, E.H.C. (2002). Marketisation and the Changing Governance in Higher Education: A Comparative Study. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 14(1), 51-83.

121 Court, D. (2000).*Financing Higher Education in Africa: Makerere, the Quiet Revolution*. World Bank and Rockefeller Foundation.

Cloete and Kulati (2002),[122] Webster and Mosoetsa (2001)[123] and Johnson and Cross (2004)[124], the changing nature of management is reported. Recently experiences internationally in Finland, Norway, Austria, Portugal, United Kingdom, Australia, United States and South Africa have been brought together in a book entitled "The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?"[125] This compilation of studies tells the story of the corporatisation of university management from different corners of the globe.

From these works a number of common managerial features are clear.

Firstly, administrative and academic structures have been brought together to form a unitary model. This is evident in the deans having greater managerial responsibilities. They do not, however, fit neatly into line management function of the corporate structure as they have historically been drawn from academia and have been a bridge between administration and academia.

Secondly, with the increased importance given to managerial activities, managerial structures are hierarchically based on a line management structure from the level of the vice-chancellor or college directors down to heads of colleges or schools.

Thirdly, given the shift to managerial responsibilities, academics in management positions are required to have managerial skills and experience. These are often not found among academics and therefore external advertising of positions, the

---

122 Cloete, N. & Kulati, T. (2003). Managerialism within a Framework of Cooperative Governance? In A. Amaral, et al. (Eds.). *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Higher Education Dynamics: 3. Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht. p. 229-250.

123 Webster, E. & Mosoetsa, S. (2001). *At the Chalk Face: Managerialism and the changing Academic Workplace, 1995-2001.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the South African Sociological Association. UNISA, Pretoria

124 Cross, M and Johnson, B. (2004). Academic Leadership under Siege: Possibilities and Limits of Executive Deanship at the University of the Witwatersrand. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 18(2), pp34-58.

125 Amaral, A., et al. (2003). *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Higher Education Dynamics: 3. Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

appointment of managers and, a change in selection criteria has taken place to ensure that managers have relevant skills; and the provision for managerial training is also needed.

Fourthly, executive positions have been strengthened through the creation of a senior executive team vis-a-vis the position of the councils at both the central and faculty levels. The university and faculty councils have become representative advisory bodies for students and employees instead of 'heavily equipped governing bodies'.

Fifthly, they identify an increase in the power of the dean at the faculty level. [126]

Other distinctions in the governance arrangements are mixed[127] leadership that straddles executive[128] and representative leadership,[129] and 'soft' and 'hard managerialism'.[130]

In the Dutch case, executive decision making is shared between the council of the institutions and the board, with neither dominating in the decision making of the institution.[131] De Boer, Denter and Goedegebuure (1998) show a similar mixed tendency with representatives at council feeling constrained in their ability to affect decision making, and faculty representatives feeling that they are able to

---

126 De Boer, H. & Huisman, J. (1999). The New Public Management in Dutch universities Chapter 5. In D. Braun & F-X. Merrien (Eds.). *Towards a new model of governance for universities? A Comparative View*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, p 7.

127 Mixed leadership refers to a combination of executive and representative leadership.

128 Executive leadership refers to the dominance of management in institutional decision making.

129 Representative leadership refers to democratically elected members of governing bodies.

130 Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2), 11.

131 De Boer, H., et al. (1998). On Boards and Councils; Shaky Balances Considered the Governance of Dutch Universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 11(2/3), 153-164.

affect decisions. They argue that power has tilted in favour of executive leadership.[132]

Trow (1994), in his study of the Academic Profession in England, illustrates the rise of managerialism in England and distinguishes between a 'hard' and 'soft' managerial approach.[133] He argues that those who are supportive of the soft managerial approach come from inside the institution's administration and academia, and those supportive of the hard managerial approach come from outside the institution, such as industry and government. The latter do not 'trust' that individual institutions will be able to run their institutions more efficiently on their own and so favour steering mechanisms through, for example funding, to ensure that this happens.[134] Hard managerialists[135] are concerned with: (i) the withdrawal of 'trust' from the academic community by government; and (ii) the drive to find a 'bottom line' against which improvements in higher education and reduction in unit costs can be measured.[136]

---

132 De Boer, H., Denters, B & Goedegebuure, L. (1998).On Boards and Councils; Shaky Balances Considered the Governance of Dutch Universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 11(2/3), 153-164.

133 Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England. *Higher Education Policy,* 7(2), 11.

134 Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2), 11.

135 Through the 'Thatcher Revolution', a number of policies were set in place that facilitated the 'hard' concept of management. These were the abolition of the Universities Grants Committee that had been created in 1919 and served as a buffer body between state and higher education institutions. The Higher Education Funding Councils replaced the Committee. The councils were not intended to be buffer bodies. They are explicitly an arm of government and exist to ensure that government policy is implemented within higher education institutions. Secondly, funding for research and teaching was separated and committees assessed these units appointed by the Higher Education Funding Councils. Thirdly, these shifts were intended to create an atmosphere of competitiveness between various production units, as they aimed to reduce their inefficiencies and so increase their share in the market.

136 Trow, M. (1994). Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England. *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2), 11.

2.6 Studies on Higher Education Management: Conceptual Limitations

What is evident from studies conducted into managerial change in higher education is that managerial change is defined as managerialism, irrespective of variations of the phenomenon as offered by Trow's notion of 'hard' and 'soft' managerialism. This tendency is referred to as 'essentialist reductionism' in this thesis. 'Essentialist reductionism' is referred to here in a general sense, while it is recognised that these notions are rooted within philosophy. 'Essentialist reductionism' is a combination of 'essentialism', which is 'the belief that it is possible to establish the truth of any scientific theory',[137] and 'reductionism' which refers to the tendency to absolutise one explanation and interpretation at the expense of others.

Instead of an 'essentialist reductionism', this thesis presents the 'specificity' of managerialism, through investigating a single case of managerial change in higher education. 'Specificity' here refers to emphasis on peculiarity, context sensitivity or socially embedded conceptualisation. The thesis considers the case within the realm of its social embeddedness for example, its legacy, surrounding environment and institutional culture.

When considering the 'specificity' or the 'social embeddedness' of managerialism, the legacy of collegiality is given particular attention as a historical legacy of higher education internationally. Conceptually, this notion has been treated as oppositional to 'managerialism' without sufficient attention being given to its integrative function within the organisational regime of managerialism.

---

[137] Johnson, A.G. (2003). The *Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology: A User's Guide to Sociological Languages*. (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell Publishing. p. 108.

2.7 Conceptions of Collegiality

Tapper and Palfreyman (2000) show that the legacy of collegiality is linked to the prestigous ancient traditional universities of Oxford and Cambridge,[138] which have historically been enclosed to the gentry and nobility. In its original form, collegiality can be traced back to 'the European collegiate movement', which dates back to the founding of the College of Sorbonne in the University of Paris in 1257/58. The College of Sorbonne was regarded as the exemplar of collegiality and was followed by Oxford and Cambridge. It was a secular medieval college, which was autonomous and self-governing with its own statutes and endowments. Collegiality from its origins has been associated with institutions of communal living and working, with their own governance arrangements and teaching obligations. Given the emphasis upon community, collegiality was also understood as 'colleagueship'[139] or 'colleague control'.[140]

Similarly, Cobban (cited in Tapper & Palfreyman, 2000) emphasises autonomy:

> Key features of college **autonomy** are: the self-governing community of fellows organised on democratic lines within the parameters of the college's royal charter and its statues, and as supervised by the 'visitor', with the right themselves to elect and to add to their number. In short, they exercise the sovereignty of the governing body of the fellows acting as the corporation. Also they appoint from amongst themselves the college officers, and select their students.[141]

Their special feature of autonomy places academics in a privileged position by standing outside of the rest of society and retaining accountability only to themselves.

---

138 Also noted by Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models. In *Theories of Educational Management*. (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing. p. 55.

135 Tapper, T. & Palfreyman, D. (2000). *Oxford and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition.* London: Woburn Press. p. 2-3.

140 Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). *Collegiality, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England, Armadale, p. 33.

141 Tapper, T. & Palfreyman, D. (2000). Oxford *and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition.* London:Woburn Press. p.3.

Other than this privilege, Bess (cited in Tapper & Palfreyman, 2000) emphasises three components of collegiality:

> The first is **culture** (or normative framework); the second, **decision making** structure; and the third the **process of behaving**, which is constrained by the first two. As a culture, collegiality comprises unevenly distributed set of beliefs about what is appropriate behaviour in the organisation. As a decision making structure, collegiality is a formal, manifested set of organisational rules for decisions to be made…and as a process, collegiality is a behaviour set governing individual action and interaction among faculty and between faculty and administrators, and is guided by both culture and structure.[142]

Put simply collegiality is the **organisation of consent** among academics[143] which only works if they share a common culture.

Smyth (1989) sets out a number of features of collegiality which he argues need to be promoted in higher education institutions as a counter discourse to encroaching managerialism. He mentions four features of collegiality as: (i) promoting **sharing, trust and participation**; (ii) **empowerment** of a knowledge community in, for example, assessment of their work; (iii) recovering and encouraging a **shared commitment** by a community of scholars who hold shared assumptions and perspectives; and (iv) **participation** in the design of policies of those who will be affected by them and will have to work within them.[144]

Bush (1995) provides a comprehensive summary of five features of collegiality:

- it is **normative** in its orientation in that it strives to ensure that decision making is based upon agreement;
- it is based upon the **authority of the expert**;
- it assumes that those involved in decision making share a **common set of values**;

---

142 Tapper, T. & Palfreyman, D. (2000). Oxford *and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition*. London:Woburn Press. p. 19.

143 Tapper, T. & Palfreyman, D. (2000). Oxford *and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition* London:Woburn Press. p. 19.

144 Smyth, J. (1989). Collegiality as a Counter Discourse to the Intrusion of Corporate Management in Higher Education. *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, 11(2), 143-155.

- while a small organisation is the most optimal condition for collegiality, the problem of a large **sized** organisation is dealt with through representatives whose power has to be shared with the staff who elected them; and
- decisions are reached by **consensus** which is informed by an *ethical* concern that if the professional lives of those upon whom decisions will impact is affected, then they need to be involved in decision making. It is also informed by a *moral* concern that if authority is exercised with consent then it has a moral basis, but if authority is exercised without consent then this would merely be an exercise of power.[145]

Carpenter (2002) provides the most persuasive analysis of collegiality, as she is interested in the source of collegiality. She argues that elite knowledge professions derive their power from their knowledge as both creators and disseminators of this knowledge, which is expressed in their teaching and research and is evaluated by their peers. To engage in this kind of work they are required to have autonomy over their daily activities and the freedom to express their ideas (academic freedom).

'Collegiality' is peculiar to specialised knowledge enclosures and does not include other stakeholders such as support service staff or students.[146] Waters significantly influenced this discussion by Carpenter. Waters (1989) highlights three key characteristics of collegiality:

> The **exercise of authority** on the sole basis of expertise is the first and most important component of collegiality. A second theme that runs throughout analyses of collegiality is that of **equality**…authority based on the technical competence of a 'company of equals'. Indeed equality is implied by expert authority. The third theme is **consensus**. All members of such organisations must participate in the decision making process, and only decisions that have the full support of the entire collective 'carry the weight of moral authority'.[147]

---

145 Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models In *Theories of Educational Management.* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing. p. 53-55.

146 Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). Collegiality*, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England: Armadale.

147 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 955.

In addition to these components, Waters (1989) mentions the **'high degree of specialisation'**, which is an elaboration upon the notion of 'company of equals'. He highlights two key features of collegiality.

First, collegial structures are those in which there is dominant orientation to a consensus achieved between the members of a body of experts who are theoretically equal in their levels of expertise but who are specialised by area of expertise.[148]

Second, collegiality is a principle, which is meant to operate among those whose authority is based upon their expertise, who are equal with reference to being specialists in various knowledge occupations but differ in their areas of specialisation.

These above mentioned definitions refer to collegiality in an ideal typical form. The emphasis upon consensus, decision making and shared values suggests commonality, homogeneity, a shared world outlook or shared backgrounds among members of the institution. Considering these definitions of collegiality, it seems clearer that the literature on managerialism and collegiality tend to run parallel to each other because managerialism tends to undermine the conditions for collegiality, for example, unconstrained resource allocation tends to secure greater levels of academic autonomy. Even so, when considering the nature of collegiality in this thesis, the authority or power of academics as rooted within their knowledge and their relationships, which characterises their work, has to be analysed, as it is this that is the foundation of collegiality and their autonomy.

Weber considers collegiality within an organisational context and does not view it in a positive way as Durkheim does. While Durkheim regards collegial relations as an association or solidarity within occupational corporation and therefore the basis of transcendent normative structures, Weber sees it as a divisive process of retaining relations of inequality and furthermore predicts 'a retreat from collegiality, certainly in the political sphere, in the face of advancing

---

[148] Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 956.

bureaucratisation, which offers the clear advantages of rapid decision making and efficient administration'. With reference to the political sphere, he regards collegiality as not only associated with universities but in contexts in which professionalisation exists, for example the legal and medical professions.[149]

Weber discusses collegial structures in contradistinction to bureaucratic administrative structures and states why he thinks collegial arrangements are ultimately regarded as being inferior to bureaucratic arrangements:

> Collegiality almost inevitably involves obstacles to precise, clear, and above all, rapid decision…With the progressive increase in the necessity for rapid decision and action, however, the importance of this type of collegiality has declined.[150]

Collegiality is the organising principle through which status group enclosure or professionalism is achieved. The organisational characteristics of collegiality are: (i) theoretical knowledge, which may be specialised or differentiated and shared with non-knowledge holders such as students; (ii) professional careers,[151] which are rooted in vocational commitments transcending individual self-interest; (iii) formal egalitarianism of persons who share the same[152] level and equal status even if at another institution, for example, professors; (iv) formal autonomy[153] which includes self-controlling and self-policing; (v) scrutiny of product is undertaken by peer evaluation and informal control mechanisms; and

---

149 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 945-951.

150 Cited in Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 953.

151 The career structure is characterised by two stages, namely, the apprentice and the practitioner which the electee obtains through the scrutiny of those the electee aspires to be. The other characteristic of the professional career is the security of tenure which is granted once the person has gone through the apprenticeship and has been found to be suitable.

152 If differentiation is evident, the source thereof is social stratification between institutions.

153 Its two associated aspects are freedom to action in achieving professional goals and self-regulation.

(vi) collective decision making of which the committee structure is the prototypical collegial decision making body.[154]

While the above point to the ideal type of collegial structure, this of course is not fully attained and organisations tend to approximate collegial structures. In reality a mix between collegial and bureaucratic features is often seen. Waters refers to three types, which are of particular interest to this study. These are: (i) exclusively collegial organisations in which roles are not differentiated into professional and administrative; (ii) predominantly collegial organisations in which professional activities are central to the organisation and administrative functions are sub-ordinated; and (iii) intermediate collegiate organisations in which professionals are subordinated to bureaucratic structures with very little autonomy for professionals as they are incorporated within bureaucratic decision making systems.[155]

Waters warns, however, that in instances in which collegial and bureaucratic structures co-exist, "the non imperative nature of collegial decisions and the inefficiencies of collegial administration will ensure that any contest between bureaucratic and collegial elements will always be unequal".[156]

In summary, collegiality has been associated with the following main features: (i) power or authority by virtue of expertise; (ii) relationship to bureaucratic pressure (autonomy); (iii) decision making processes which emphasise consensus and draw on committee system, sharing and peer review; (iv) high degree of specialisation and professionalisation; and (v) stratified or hierarchical organisational structures.

---

154 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 956-959.

155 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 959-961.

156 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 961.

As it will be shown below, the association of collegiality with equality is the more problematic.

2.7.1 A Critique of Collegiality

Those who critique 'collegiality' suggest that the creation of a 'company of equals' or the creation of a community of professionals creates relations of inequality[157] and a stratified and hierarchical structure, very often according to gender, class, ethnicity, race and seniority. Relations of inequality are evident within the 'company of equals' between junior and senior staff or the 'god professors',[158] as collegiality intersects with bureaucratic and hierarchical structures or between men and women as collegial relations[159] have historically been exercised within male peer groups, dating back to the medieval 'community of scholars'.[160] Their gender, class, ethnicity and other socially constructed groups of inferior status may define groups that may be excluded from collegial relations.[161] Within this 'company of equals' therefore some are more equal than others, with inequality evident in relation to those excluded from the 'company of

---

157 Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, Bureaucratisation, and Professionalism: a Weberian Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 947.

158 Noted by Currie, J. & Vidovich, L. (1998). The Ascent toward Corporate Managerialism in American and Australian Universities. In R. Martin (Ed.), *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University*. Durham and London: Duke University Press. p.112.

159 Blackmore discusses the problematic nature of collegiality from a feminist perspective. She captures this neatly when she draws upon Helene Moglen who states that 'where the power is the women are not' (Blackmore, J. (2002). Globalisation and the Restructuring of Higher Education for New Knowledge Economies: New Dangers or Old Habits Troubling Gender Equity Work in Universities? *Higher Education Quarterly,* 56(4), 66).

160 Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). *Collegiality, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England, Armadale, p. 26-32.

161 Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). *Collegiality, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England, Armadale, p.33.

equals'.[162] The implication of this for knowledge production and academic disciplines is that it has been the preserve of a white male dominated culture as has been the case in South Africa. This culture is reproduced through a process of 'homosocial reproduction'[163] in which 'men acquire and control human and material resources, including women'.[164] Drawing upon Bourdieu in *Homo Academicus*, Carpenter states it slightly differently as

> …The traditional academic habitusis cited as typically male and characterised by the following determinants: economic capital (class) and most importantly 'inherited culture and social capital' – the 'right' family background and connections as well as elite schooling and educational credentials.[165]

Clark (2001) argues strongly that collegiality has for some time now not existed within the large scale university, which has become a multiversity with large faculties in a diversity of areas. He objects to those who rake up collegiality as a characteristic of traditional universities in opposition to the entrepreneurial university, as he regards it as a defensive ideology, which serves the status quo.[166]

Tapper and Palfreyman (2000) further note other traditional objections to collegiality.

> The collegiate model itself is not without flaws. First, it can be presented as **conceptually naïve**, romantic even, since it underplays the extent of differences and competing interests arising from the diversity of members and disciplines. In periods of unfavourable economic conditions, conflict can arise over scarce resources, rendering the model

---

[162] Durkheim refers to 'occupation corporation' when he discusses the associations of members who belong to a similar occupation in *The Division of Labour in Society*.

[163] Carpenter draws on a term that was coined by Kanter, which builds upon Lipman-Blumen's thesis, which refers to 'the perpetuation of homosociality among men'.

[164] Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002). *Collegiality, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England, Armadale, p.33.

[165] Carpenter, G.P.M. (2002*). Collegiality, Corporate Management and Equity in the Restructured University: Implications for Women Academics in Australian Higher Education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New England, Armadale, p.38.

[166] Clark, B. (2001). The Entrepreneurial University: New Foundations for Collegiality, Autonomy, and Achievement. *Higher Education Management*, 13 (2), 18.

> inadequate. Second, it can be seen as **operationally dysfunctional** because the bedrock of the model, the committee system, is frequently in tension with policy and strategy formation. Over-reliance on committees can be criticised for leading to delays in decision making, impeding individual initiatives and leadership and creating uncertainty over both the finality of decisions and responsibility for their implementation.[167]

Bush (1995) also provides an overview of the kinds of criticisms that have been levelled at collegial models.

He mentions seven criticisms of collegiality as: (i) in as far as collegial models are **normative**, they suggest what ought to be but do not describe what actually takes place within institutions; (ii) it is associated with **slow and cumbersome decision making processes**; (iii) it assumes that decisions are reached via consensus which is often not the case and rather, as, Baldridge argues, decision making is often riddled with **conflict** and if consensus is attained, it is preceded by conflictual relations; (iv) collegiality does not exist in a vacuum and often comes up against **hierarchical and bureaucratic structures**; (v) collegial models are difficult to maintain as they are often in tension with pressure for leaders to **account to external authorities**; (vi) whether collegial models are effective too depends upon the **attitude of staff** and whether they are interested in being participative; and (vii) collegial relations are not necessarily inherent in the system but are a function of the **head's leadership style**.[168]

While various critiques of collegiality have been highlighted above, the most critical to this study is the understanding that collegiality assumes different forms and characteristics in different contexts. In South Africa for example collegiality has been fashioned predominantly by racialised overtones.

---

[167] Tapper, T. & Palfreyman, D. (2000). *Oxford and the Decline of the Collegiate Tradition* London: Woburn Press. p.21-22.

[168] Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models. In *Theories of Educational Management.* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing. p.66-69.

2.8 The Collegial – Managerial Nexus[169]

As discussed in Chapter 2, it is agreed that the forces of global change have brought managerial pressures to bear upon the public sector and particularly on collegial relations within higher education institutions. What managerialism institutionalises within higher education as discussed by Bessant (1988) is a Taylorist organisational structure in which conception is separated from execution evident in the professionalisation of the managerial function in higher education.

Bush (1995) states that

> universities have not only survived the 1980s, but in certain ways have prospered…by becoming more managerial…There is no doubt that in the short run this has worked, but we have quite serious doubts concerning the long term, particularly as one of the effects…has been a considerable loss in collegiality across the higher education system, with the resulting loss of a sense of ownership and shared professional responsibility for the organisation of the institution.[170]

Brett (1997) argues that competition poses a threat to collegial relations as it threatens the 'professional, co-operative aspects to discipline based academic work', in that competition encourages academics to associate with an institutional identity as institutions compete for students, research grants and funding, and not first and foremost with their discipline which has very little to do with their individual employing institutions.[171]

However, neither managerialism nor collegiality is sufficient to understand the changing nature of management in universities. As universities are required to become more competitive, managerialist modes are implemented within institutions, which alter collegial relations and also affect managerialism. Managerialism cannot simply be implemented as in any other workplace because

---

[169] This heading was inspired by a heading used by Carpenter in her PhD thesis "The Collegiality-Bureaucracy Nexus", p.31.

[170] Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models in *Theories of Educational Management*, (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing. p.56.

[171] Brett, J. (1997). Competition and Collegiality. *Australian Universities Review*, 19(22), 19-22.

the most skilled, independent and variously knowledgeable are found on the shopfloor in the university, which is contrary to the typical workplace design. Conceptual tools that take the shifting and changing nature of both managerialism and collegiality into account add greater conceptual rigour in understanding current trends in university management.

2.9 The Conceptual Framework of this Study

Three key dimensions inform the conceptual framework that will guide this study: (i) the analytical approach of managerial change offered by Ramirez; (ii) the core/non-core organisational change framework; and (iii) the relation between managerialism and collegiality.

(i) Ramirez's (2004) conceptual framework provides some understanding of the nature of management change to this study. He points out that managerial change is not just a consequence of global economic trends but also of the pressure by society for institutions to become more responsive to its needs, by addressing concerns of equity, social justice and human rights. The intention was for these concerns not simply to remain as principles and stated institutional commitments, but implementable strategies. One such strategy would be to alter universities' curricula to reflect, for example, cultural tolerance and thereby contribute to the development of an active democratic citizenship. Another strategy would be to broaden avenues for social interaction, for example, through extra mural activities to further facilitate acceptance of diverse cultures and practices. Shifting the institutional values and practices to reflect the concerns of the South, and Africa in particular, remains a concern. Post 1994 in South Africa with the election of a new democratic government, there were especially heightened societal expectations that social justice concerns, more than the drive of global economic forces, would be addressed by the South African state and institutions.

Ramirez' theoretical framework which integrates both these social concerns and economic pressures, allows one to broaden one's analytical framework, not only to focus on the forces of global capitalism, but to incorporate the pressures

emerging from social movements and mass democratic movements which cumulatively shape and reconfigure the social and political nature of universities.

The analytical implications of Ramirez's theoretical intervention are the following: (i) the need to account for the specific contextual complexities of changes in universities; (ii) that even though the origins of institutions to bring about change may emerge from above as is the case in the Bologna declaration, or from below as in the case in the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, institutions cannot escape the impact of global and local pressures; (iii) the need to understand the complexity of the stakeholder university; and (iv) how new relations and tensions are created as institutions attempt to find balance between both the economic demands and social responsibility demands.

(ii) The study is informed by the core/non-core framework, which has been used to guide internal organisational change processes and practices. This framework will be used to explore the changing nature of internal organisational processes and practices. While relying upon this framework to navigate the restructuring process, the framework is complex as it is riddled by the contradiction of addressing efficiency concerns through, for example, outsourcing, and while at the same time recognising the social responsibility of institutions which had historically been employment intensive at lower levels of the workforce.

(iii) The global context of higher education management has changed as discussed above. There has been a significant identifiable trend towards corporate management practice in higher education management practice. While insufficient consideration has been given to the change within collegiality, this study is concerned with collegial relations and suggests here that collegiality is altered with the penetration of new managerial relations, as is managerialism.

In Chapter 3 I discuss my methodological journey in conducting this research.